DD/S 69-0036

2 2 JAN 1969

25X1

25X1

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT

: Attrition Among Support Career Trainees

REFERENCE

: Memo dtd 13 Dec 68, frm C/CTP/OTR, to DD/S,

same subject

1. I have reviewed the referent memorandum and its attached study compiled by Mr ______ of the Career Training Staff, and I am most appreciative of the effort that went into the preparation of this report. However, I believe that there are certain areas of the report which must be clarified in order to put the subject problem in proper perspective and to put us in a better position to solve this costly attrition of our Support Career Trainees.

2. Our records with a few minor exceptions confirm the basic statistics of the study. There were twenty-one resignations and seven transfers among the Support CT's who graduated from the Support Services Courses in the period of April 1966 and June 1968. DD/S figures indicate there were 125 not 123 Support CT's in this group. Neither nor actually entered the Support Services career management system; however, two other individuals - whose names do not appear in Mr. compilation - were both in the group under review and were participants in the Support Services career system.

3. On another score, the referent memorandum implies that individual DD/S offices cited "lost a considerable number of careerists." This I think is misleading. For in the old generalist concept, under which all but of a few of these Support Career Trainees were assigned, it was not necessarily intended that the Career Trainee enter the career service of the office of his first assignment. As a matter of fact, many of the initial assignments of these Career Trainees were based not on the individual Career Trainee's choice but on an office requirement or the availability



25X1

| of a position to which he could be assigned. Thus, of the twenty-eight individuals listed in the noted CTP data, only three (Finance) and (Security) were actually assigned under the new Support CT Concept (that is, the concept of the office of first assignment being the "elected" career service of the assigned CT). |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. Again the referent study appears to equate transfers with losses. Such is certainly not the case. The fact that a CT found that his career niche was elsewhere than the Support Services should not be reflected as a "career loss." Rather, we should look upon these changes as in the best interest of the Agency with these particular CT's hopefully embarked on a more appropriate career path. A little further look at the reasons for these "career changes" — points up, I believe, the validity of this observation: |
| a) transferred from Security to the CS to achieve early overseas assignments. |
| b) was a CS careerist at heart from the beginning, but had tried the Support Services only in deference to his wife's reluctance to an early overseas assignment. |
| c) was unable to establish himself with either the DDI or the DDS; the CS may provide the career he most obviously wants with the Agency. |
| d) transferred to the CS and OCS respectively when the "generalist" concept was changed. |
| e) after serious consideration of his future, elected transfer to the DDI and his success in assignment thus far would seem to show this is a worthwhile choice from both his and the Agency's standpoint. |
| 5. Turning to resignations, I think we must distinguish between those resignations which are, and those which clearly are not, "job related." Specifically I have in mind the cases of: |
| a) who resigned upon his recall to the U.S. Marine Corps in which he retained his reserve status for financial reasons. |

| | ~ 3 ~ | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 25X1 | b) a female CT, who resigned to accompany her husband overseas. | |
| 25X1 | who resigned for reasons of his wife's ill health. | |
| 25X1 | d) whose resignation was solicited because of personal reasons. | |
| 25X1 | e) who resigned to get an advanced degree in Psychology but who, as Mr. points out, expressed an interest in returning to the Agency. | 25X |
| 25X1 | who resigned because of a change in career interest but who has since reconsidered and has reapplied for employment with the Agency. | |
| 25X1 | g) who resigned because of the ill health of his | |
| 25X1 | h) who entered the CT Program looking toward a career in the CS but who "chose" the DDS because of his marriage. | |
| | Removing these cases as "not job related" leaves us with twelve CT's who apparently resigned for job-related reasons. I say apparently because the records in these cases are not all as clear as that of definitely a "job-related" resignee who refused to accept a Support assignment in the Near East and resigned after his assignment in WH/Personnel. | 25X |
| | 6. Considering a more significant area of our problem, the recruitment of new trainees for the Support Services, the referent memorandum expresses a strong view that our difficulty in recruitment stems from the new Support CT policy which can be summarized as the specialist versus the generalist concept. I am not convinced that such is the case. First, I am not satisfied that the recruitment mechanism has had sufficient time and experience in the application of the new concept and the new Support CT criteria. Second, I am not sure whether our "dearth" of recruits is the result of a lack of files for review or a selection process in the review of available files which might be so restrictive as to rule out applicants who might be potential candidates for the various Support Career Services. In any event, the case in my opinion is not so black and white as to call for a judgment against the new concept at this time; rather all of the factors I have considered lead more located by to | |
| | this time; rather all of the factors I have considered lead more logically to the conclusion that there is a need for reappraisal of the implementation of our new policy. | |

SECHE

- 7. A word is also in order I think on what at first blush appears to be a "short-fall" in meeting our Support requirements. Certainly we would like to have had more Support CT's in the pipeline than is evidenced in our current figures. However, while I am concerned about the March 1909 class -- and its possible impact on FY-70 requirements, I do not believe we face a manpower problem in FY-69 because of the small number in the November class. BALPA cuts and returning Support Directorate CT's can be thanked for this latter fortuitous circumstance which does give us a breathing spell which I think necessary not only for reappraisal, but also for the revalidation of FY-70 requirements.
- 8. My comments and observations are not intended to minimize the problem of Career Trainee attrition. Rather, I want to point up the fact that I believe we must analyze more carefully the more immediate problem areas -- recruitment and selection -- of our CT program. By doing this, we shall be able to provide the necessary guidance and assistance not only to our recruiters but also to all of our Agency elements who may or should be involved in the selection and subsequent employment and assignment of our Support Career Trainees. In order to do that, I would like Mr. _______ to chair a meeting which would include Mr. _______ with members of his Support Operations Staff, to discuss this problem further and to provide me through your Office with such recommendations for improvement in our program as may be appropriate.

SIEMED R. L. Bannerman

25X1

25X1

R. L. Bannerman Deputy Director for Support

Distribution:

O & 1 - Adse

1 - DD/S Subject w/. O-Ref (DD/S 68-6143) & background (Support CT Program)

1 - DD/S Chrono

1 - SOS/DDS Chrono

SOS/DDS:FVD-JEF:lsm(6 Jan 69)

SECRET

68-61431

13 December 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

THROUGH

: Director of Training

SUBJECT

25X1

: Attrition Among Support Career Trainees

1. There is attached a study compiled by Mr. of the Career Training Staff concerning attrition among Career Trainees assigned to the Support Services between April 1966 and June 1968.

25X1

- 2. The results of this study reveal that there is a significant disparity between the attrition rate among Career Trainees assigned to the Support Services (22.9%) and that of Career Trainees assigned to the Directorate for Intelligence (7.2%) and the Clandestine Services (6.4%) during the same period. Particularly disappointing have been our experiences with Career Trainees assigned to the Offices of Security and Logistics, where the loss rates have been 50% and 38%, respectively.
- 3. In general, limited opportunity for overseas assignment, lack of immediate job challenge, and inability to perceive any plan for career development appear to be the major reasons for this high rate of attrition among Support Career Trainees.
- 4. Moreover, CTP is experiencing major difficulty in recruiting new trainees for the Support Services. While the Program has filled the DD/I and DD/P quotas in the November 1968 Class and in the forthcoming March 1969 Class, there are only three Support candidates in the November 1968 Class (against a target of ten) and none yet for the March 1969 Class.

SECRET

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic downgrading and declassification

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003100120001-6 SFCRET

SUBJECT: Attrition Among Support Career Trainees

- 5. While it may be an oversimplification, our experience over a long period of time forces the conclusions that the Support trainee prospect is attracted to the Agency by the expectation of broad administrative responsibilities and overseas assignment at an early point in time, but subsequently is disappointed on both counts and chooses to go elsewhere.
- 6. Consequently, I believe that the present Support CT Program is not likely to produce as many young Support careerists as hoped and is in need of re-evaluation to achieve consistency between its objectives and practicalities.

| ~ | biof | C | m • | |
|---|------|--------|----------|---------|
| V | mer, | Career | Training | Program |

Attachment

25X1

SECRET

6 December 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Career Training Program

SUBJECT

: Attrition DDS/Career Trainees

- 1. This memorandum covers the period between April 1966 and June 1968, encompassing seven Support Services Courses.
- 2. 145 CTs attended Support Services Courses of which 123 were assigned to the DDS. Of the 123 CTs assigned, 21 or 17% resigned and seven or 5.7% transferred out of the DDS. 28 CTs or 22.9% resigned or transferred out of DDS.
 - 3. Losses during this period by DDS offices were as follows:

| Office | First Assign- ment | Resignations | Transfers | % Over- all Loss |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| OS OL OF OP OC CS/Sup Other | 18 16 13 20 6 36 14 | 6 - 33 1/3% 2 - 12 1/2% 3 - 23% 3 - 15% 0 - 0% 4 - 11% 3 - 21.4% | 3 4 0 0 0 0 | 50% 38% 23% 15% 0% 11% 21.4% |
| Totals | Average Age Rea Average Grade I Average Tenure | Resignations | 7 - 5.7% 30 years GS-9.4 20.8 months | 22.9% |

STAT

Attachments

| 25X1 31 GS-11.3 Oct 63 (internal) 27 GS-10 Sep 66 DDP/CTP DDP/ 29 GS-08 Jun 64 (internal) 34 GS-11 Jun 66 DDS/OL DDI/ 29 GS-10 Feb 68 DDS/OS DDP/ 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP/ 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP/ 25X1 | 01-6 | DR003100120001-6 | GREDP84-0078 | ase 2003/05/05 E | ved For Rele | Appro | GEAUST 1/- | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------|------------|------|
| (internal) 27 GS-10 Sep 66 DDP/CTP DDP/ 29 GS-08 Jun 64 (internal) 34 GS-11 Jun 66 DDS/OL DDI/ 29 GS-10 Feb 68 DDS/OS DDP/ 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP/ 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP/ | rred Reason | Transferred | Ass. | EOD | Grade | Age | Name | |
| 29 GS-08 Jun 64 DDS/OS DDP/ (internal) 34 GS-11 Jun 66 DDS/OL DDI/ 29 GS-10 Feb 68 DDS/OS DDP/ 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP/ 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP/ | TP Unhappy with O/L. Lack challenge, routine assig ment. H.S. grads can do work, no visible career management plans. Treat like warehouse type. | DDP/CTP | DDS/OL | | GS-11.3 | 31 | | 25X1 |
| (internal) 34 GS-11 Jun 66 DDS/OL DDI, 29 GS-10 Feb 68 DDS/OS DDP, 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP, 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP, | A Civil Engineer took sa cut to leave OL to go in the Clandestine Services felt he had greater inte in the CS. | DDP/FE | DDP/CTP | Sep 66 | GS-10 | 27 | | (|
| 29 GS-10 Feb 68 DDS/OS DDP, 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP, 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP, | Assigned to clerical dut no overseas opportunity. Refused Security designa and after OC courses was assigned to DDP/FE/ | DDP/FE | DDS/OS | | GS-08 | 29 | | |
| 29 GS-09 Jan 67 DDS/OS DDP, 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP, 25X1 | ER After a period with O/L was dissatisfied with Lotics; was reassigned to after IPC. | DDI/OER | DDS/OL | Jun 66 | GS-11 | 34 | | |
| 28 GS-10 Nov 67 DDS/OL DDP. | TP Not happy in OS; felt hi most interest and best talents were in CS. | DDP/CTP | DDS/OS | Feb 68 . | GS-10 | 29 | | |
| 25X1 CECDET | TP Wanted to get into oper- ations; did not find OS challenging. | DDP/CTP | DDS/OS | Jan 67 | GS-09 | 29 | | |
| CECDET | TP An extra who was assi to O/L after CTP. Was d satisfied because of lac of overseas assignment a | DDP/CTP | DDS/OL | Nov 67 | GS-10 | 28 | | |
| Approved For Release 2003/ 04//də Ndi/d -RDP84-00780R00310012 | career management; tran ferred to DDP/CTP. | DR003100120001-6 | LA-RDP84-0078 | ase 2003 0 | ved For Rele | Appro | | 25X1 |

Approved For Release 2003/05/05: CIA-REP84-00780R003100120001-6

Age Grade POR

25X1

| Name | Age | Grade | EOD | Ass. | Resigned | Reason |
|------|-----|---------------|----------------------|--------|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 29 | GS-10.2 | Jan 66 | DDS/OF | 6/68 | Slow progress; lack of challenge; better job with Chase Manhattan Bank. |
| | 29 | GS-08 / | Mar 66 | DDS/OS | 1/68 | 25X1 Lack of challenge in O/S; was assigned to filing initially, then transferred to for same type or work - clerical work. |
| | 30 | GS- 09 | Sep 66 | DDS/OP | 8/67 | Career change. Primarily interested in CS, but chose DDS because of marriage. Wanted DDS job in CS. |
| | 32 | GS-10.2 | Jul 66 | DDS/OP | 12/68 | Did not find DDS/OP chal- lenging and exciting; not enough to do; returned to go into CS training; will be resigning to return to Air Force. |
| | 33 | GS-10 | Jun 67 | DDS/OS | 3/68 | Financial reasons. Large family; could not afford D.C. living - (returned) to USMC. |
| | 26 | GS-09 | Jul 66 (internal) | DDS/OP | 1/68 | Married CT; resigned to accompany husband overseas 25X1 |
| | 26 | GS-09 | Jul 65 | OTR/ | 3/68 | Primarily interested in CS. Consented to DDS because of wife's ill health. Resigned for further schooling. |

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 ECAR P84-00780R003100120001-6

| Name | Age 1 | <u>Grade</u> | EOD | Ass. | Resigned | Reason |
|------|----------|----------------|--------|---------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 29 | G S- 09 | Mar 66 | DDS/OF | 4/67 | Undecided re career in CIA - was given disappointing assignment in DDS/OF. 25X1 Resigned to go into banking. |
| | 29 | GS-09 | Sep 67 | DDS/OF | 10/68 | Was (transferred to DDP/FE 5/19/68; resigned because of lack of promotion. |
| | 31 | GS-10 | Jun 67 | DDS/OS | 5/68 | Dissatisfied with O/S. Could not foresee long-term job satisfaction. Resigned and accepted assistantship at LSU to work towards PhD. |
| | 28 | GS-09 | Jun 66 | FE/Sup | 4/68 ND | Wanted CS but because of wife's ill health was placed in Support School with assignment to FE/Support. Resigned a year later because of no further interest in Agency. |
| | 27 | GS-09 | Mar 66 | DDP/CTP | 9/68 | Assigned to DDP/CTP because of lack of interest in DDS. Resigned when he civilianized because he found no challenge in the Agency. |
| | 34 | GS-11.2 | Jun 66 | DDS/OL | 9/68 | Commented CTs too often assigned to jobs below qualifications and that promotion policy too conservative. Resigned to complete PhD at University of California. |

| . • | Name | Approv Age | ed For Relea <u>Grade</u> | se 2003/03/05/EG | RETES4#00780R003 | 3100120001-6 Resigned | Reason |
|-----|--------|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | 30 | GS-09 | Jan 67 | DDS/OMS | 5/68 | Resigned to get MA in Psychology. Expressed interest in returning to the Agency |
| | | 30 | GS-09 | May 66 | DDS/CT | 5/67 | Disappointed in low level assignment "nuts and bolts" work. Resigned to accept IRS Job. |
| | | 32 | GS-11.3 | Feb 63 (interna1) | DDS/OF | 8/68 | After 66 months with Agency (2 yrs in CTP) resigned because of change in career interest. Accepted position in international business. |
| | | 32 | GS-09.4 | Jan 69 (internal) | WH/Pers | 6/68 | Refused to accept support assignment in hardship post (NE); was reassigned to WH/Pers and resigned. |
| | | 28 | GS-09 | Apr 65 | DDS/OS | 3/67 | Because of "financial factors" resigned to accept job with IBM. |
| | | 28 | GS-09 | Feb 68 | DDS/OS | 11/68 | In CTP and O/S for nine months, resigned to pursue PhD in Psychology. |
| | | 30 | GS-09 | Mar 66 | DDS/OL | 4/67 | Unhappy with promotional opportunities in O/L. Resigned to accept IRS job at lower level. [Was not receptive to overseas assignment]. |
| | 177.04 | 30 | GS-09 | Jun 66 | DDS/OP | 10/68 | After 3 months in DDS/OP was placed in LWOP status to attend school. Accepted |
| | • . | | | SECRET | | | better paying job in private industry. |

25X1

Approved For Release 2003/05/05 : CIA-RDP84-00780R003100120001-6

